



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,432	12/10/2003	Vipul P. Patel	H0005575-1050	2140
7590 10/10/2007 Honeywell International, Inc. Law Dept. AB2 P.O. Box 2245 Morristown, NJ 07962-9806			EXAMINER KATCHEVES, BASIL S	
			ART UNIT 3633	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,432

Applicant(s)

PATEL ET AL.

Examiner

Basil Katcheves

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/10/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The applicant has elected group I, claims 1-25, without traverse in the paper dated 7/31/07. Claims 26-34 are withdrawn. Pending claims 1-25 are examined below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 2, 15, 19, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. A garage located on mars or any planet other than earth.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "station/garage" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "station/garage"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-16, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,335,447 to Bee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,030 to Hilleary.

Regarding claims 1, 14, 19, Bee discloses an inflatable station (abstract line 8) with inflator (fig. 9) capable of housing a vehicle, with external solar panels (abstract line 11) and an environmental control system (abstract lines 13-15). However, Bee does not disclose the use of two communication systems capable of receiving vehicle data. Hilleary discloses a system of receiving vehicle data (fig. 1: top left) and transmitting that data to a base (fig. 1: top right), the base then sending the data to other locations (fig. 1: bottom left and bottom right). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bee by adding this base station, as disclosed by Hilleary, in order to monitor the progress of local transportation.

Regarding claim 2, 15, Bee in view of Hilleary disclose the capability of being placed upon another planet.

Regarding claim 3, Bee discloses an environmental control system but not a particular temperature. Applicant fails to show criticality for specifically claimed temperatures, therefore it would have been an obvious design choice to use the

Art Unit: 3635

dimensions such as specified in these claims since the claimed temperature range is within standard parameters for comfort.

Regarding claims 4, 5, 16, Bee discloses the use of solar panels, or wings, (fig. 5) and energy storage (heat 74) in the inflatable station. Regarding the limitation of electrical box, structures typically contain an electrical outlets to power electrical devices.

Regarding claim 10, Bee discloses one outer door but does not disclose two outer doors at opposite sides and a door within the structure. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a front and back door for allowing entrance into the structure from more than one side as front and back doors are typical in the art of building construction. Internal rooms, such as restrooms or offices contain doors which would separate these rooms from the external doors. These are typical in building construction and therefore an obvious design choice to add to any building structure.

Regarding claims 11, 12, Bee discloses the inflatable structure as rigidizing when exposed to pressurized air.

Claims 6-8, 13, 17, 20, 22, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,335,447 to Bee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,030 to Hilleary further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,432,508 to Jackson.

Regarding claims 6-8, 17, Bee in view of Hilleary does not disclose a sensor array for guiding vehicles to and inside the structure. Jackson discloses a means of guiding vehicles into a parking area by use of an array of sensors (figs. 4-9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bee in view of Hilleary by adding a parking guiding system, as disclosed by Jackson in order to facilitate parking of vehicles within the structure. The applicant should also note that vehicles such as bicycles, carts or any other type with a narrow width are capable of being parked within the structure of Bee.

Regarding claim 13, Bee in view of Hilleary further in view of Jackson discloses vehicles capable of entering the structure of Bee (typical parking vehicles which motorcycles are included).

Regarding claim 20, Bee discloses the use of solar panels, or wings, (fig. 5) and energy storage (heat 74) in the inflatable station. Regarding the limitation of electrical box, structures typically contain an electrical outlets to power electrical devices. Bee in view of Hilleary does not disclose a sensor array for guiding vehicles to and inside the structure. Jackson discloses a means of guiding vehicles into a parking area by use of an array of sensors (figs. 4-9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bee in view of Hilleary by adding a parking guiding system, as disclosed by Jackson in order to facilitate parking of

vehicles within the structure. The applicant should also note that vehicles such as bicycles, carts or any other type with a narrow width are capable of being parked within the structure of Bee. Bee discloses one outer door but does not disclose two outer doors at opposite sides and a door within the structure. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a front and back door for allowing entrance into the structure from more than one side as front and back doors are typical in the art of building construction. Internal rooms, such as restrooms or offices contain doors which would separate these rooms from the external doors. These are typical in building construction and therefore an obvious design choice to add to any building structure.

Regarding claims 22, 24, Bee discloses an inflatable station (abstract line 8) with inflator (fig. 9) capable of housing a vehicle, with external solar panels (abstract line 11) and an environmental control system (abstract lines 13-15). However, Bee does not disclose the use of two communication systems capable of receiving vehicle data. Hilleary discloses a system of receiving vehicle data (fig. 1: top left) and transmitting that data to a base (fig. 1: top right), the base then sending the data to other locations (fig. 1: bottom left and bottom right). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bee by adding this base station, as disclosed by Hilleary, in order to monitor the progress of local transportation. Bee discloses the use of solar panels, or wings, (fig. 5) and energy storage (heat 74) in the inflatable station. Regarding the limitation of electrical box, structures typically contain an electrical outlets to power electrical devices. Bee in view of Hilleary does not

Art Unit: 3635

disclose a sensor array for guiding vehicles to and inside the structure. Jackson discloses a means of guiding vehicles into a parking area by use of an array of sensors (figs. 4-9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bee in view of Hilleary by adding a parking guiding system, as disclosed by Jackson in order to facilitate parking of vehicles within the structure. The applicant should also note that vehicles such as bicycles, carts or any other type with a narrow width are capable of being parked within the structure of Bee. Bee discloses one outer door but does not disclose two outer doors at opposite sides and a door within the structure. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a front and back door for allowing entrance into the structure from more than one side as front and back doors are typical in the art of building construction. Internal rooms, such as restrooms or offices contain doors which would separate these rooms from the external doors. These are typical in building construction and therefore an obvious design choice to add to any building structure.

Claims 9, 18, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,335,447 to Bee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,030 to Hilleary further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,427,356 to Krotov.

Regarding claim 9, Bee in view of Hilleary does not disclose a module for offloading. Krotov discloses a portable and offloader (fig. 1). It would have been

Art Unit: 3635

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the offloader of Krotov in order to lift heavy equipment.

Regarding claim 18, 21, Bee discloses one outer door but does not disclose two outer doors at opposite sides and a door within the structure. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a front and back door for allowing entrance into the structure from more than one side as front and back doors are typical in the art of building construction. Internal rooms, such as restrooms or offices contain doors which would separate these rooms from the external doors. These are typical in building construction and therefore an obvious design choice to add to any building structure. Bee in view of Hilleary does not disclose a module for offloading. Krotov discloses a portable and offloader (fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the offloader of Krotov in order to lift heavy equipment.

Claims 23, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,335,447 to Bee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,030 to Hilleary further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,432,508 to Jackson further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,427,356 to Krotov.

Regarding claim 23, 25, Bee discloses one outer door but does not disclose two outer doors at opposite sides and a door within the structure. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a front and back door for allowing entrance into the structure from more than one

Art Unit: 3635

side as front and back doors are typical in the art of building construction. Internal rooms, such as restrooms or offices contain doors which would separate these rooms from the external doors. These are typical in building construction and therefore an obvious design choice to add to any building structure. Bee in view of Hilleary does not disclose a module for offloading. Krotov discloses a portable and offloader (fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the offloader of Krotov in order to lift heavy equipment.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The cited patents listed on the included form PTO-892 further show the state of the art with respect to inflatable structures in general.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is (571) 272-6846. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot, can be reached at (571) 272-6777.

BK


Basil Katcheves

10/2/07

Primary Examiner AU 3633